



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,225	11/06/2000	Ralph Victor Bain		8358

27234 7590 04/09/2004

RALPH V. BAIN
39908 SAN SIMEON COURT
FREMONT, CA 94539-3619

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SR

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,225

Applicant(s)

BAIN, RALPH VICTOR

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 03/23/2000. Claims 1 – 36 were received for consideration. No preliminary amendments to the claims were filed. Claims 1 – 36 are currently being considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear whether the applicant intends "immediate" to be the claim limitations.

Clarification and/or correction are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al (U S Patent 6,105,012) in view of Lincke et al (U S. Patent No. 6,253,326 hereinafter "Lincke").

Regarding Claim 1, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page as said web site page is being loaded into a browser (Fig.1), comprising:

(a) providing said browser of known type which will:

(1) load said web site page (Column 3 lines 66 – Column 4 line 2),

(2) display the contents of said web site page (Column 3 lines 66 –

Column 4 line 2), and

(3) execute script functions within said web site page (Column 4 lines 2 –

8),

(b) providing an associated key which will enable the decryption of said cryptogram (Column 2 lines 30 – 38 and Column 5 lines 20 – 45),

(c) providing a decryption function which will:

(1) operate within said web site page (Column 4 lines 55 – 61), and

(2) generate said decrypted display (Column 8 lines 7 – 26),

whereby the generation of said decrypted display requires the use of said associated key (Column 8 lines 60 – 66),

whereby said cryptogram is displayed (Column 8 lines 39 – 51 and Column 11 lines),

whereby said cryptogram remains obfuscated at all times (Column 8 lines 52 – 56), and

whereby said web site is utilized as a practical and secure means for both distributing and viewing sensitive information (Column 8 lines 59 – Column 9 line 42).

Chang does not disclose that the cryptogram is displayed exactly as its contents in clear-text would have been displayed. However, Lincke discloses a communications systems and method for securely transmitting a message, wherein said cryptogram is displayed exactly as its content in clear-text would have been displayed (Lincke Column 11 lines 50 – 53, Column 13 lines 22 – 28 and Column 89 lines 51 – Column 90 line 67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chang and Lincke to implement a method for a decryption function to generate a decrypted display as taught by Chang and wherein the cryptogram is displayed exactly as its contents in clear-text would have been displayed as taught by Lincke to ensure the secure communication to exchange messages between website and browser. The motivation would have been to provide the web browser with the capabilities to generate decrypted display and the cryptogram is displayed as clear-text so that the clear-text attacks cannot be mounted as the data is encrypted at the web site page.

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said decryption function decrypts and displays a plurality of said cryptograms in a plurality of said web site pages in said web site (Column 1 lines 56 – Column 2 line 5).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said cryptogram is of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for said web site page (Column 4 lines 2 – 20). Lincke discloses a method for producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said cryptogram is of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for said web site page (Linkce Column 11 lines 50 – Column 12 line 22).

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said decryption function is able to operate in accordance with said web site page standards (Column 10 lines 38 – 47 and Column 11 lines 16 – 58). Chang does not disclose the decryption function equates two characters from two different character set by their position comprising providing a first means which will render index values for all characters allowed in said display, and

providing a second means which will render index values for all characters allowed in said cryptogram.

However Lincke discloses a method wherein a decryption function equates two characters from two different character sets by their position, comprising:

(a) providing a first means which will render index values for all characters allowed in said display (Linkey Column 82 lines 1 – 65), and

(b) providing a second means which will render index values for all characters allowed in said cryptogram (Linkey Column 12 lines 24 – 45 and Column 21 lines 59 – 65),

whereby said decryption function is able to operate in accordance with said web site page standards (Column 2 lines 2 – 25 and Column 89 lines 1 – 18).

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said decryption function obtains said associated key from a plurality of decryption keys (Column 5 lines 20 – 45 and Column 10 lines 38 – 53).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein an operator of said browser provides said plurality of decryption keys, comprising:

(a) providing a third means for sending an input request to said operator (Column 5 lines 43 – 44), and

(b) providing a key handling function which will make said plurality of decryption keys available to said decryption function (Column 5 lines 23 – 30),

whereby said operator interacts only with process contained within said web site page (Column 5 lines 23 – 45 and Column 6 lines 57 – 64) .

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 6. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said operator receives a validity report upon entry of each said decryption key, whereby said operator is afforded the convenience of immediate notice of the validity of each said decryption key (Column 11 lines 60 – Column 12 line 10).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 6. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said plurality of decryption keys are made available to all said web site pages in said web site, comprising:

(a) providing a frameset page which will establish communication between said web site pages if not already established (Column 1 lines 66 – Column 2 line 10), and

(b) providing said key-handling function which will make said plurality of decryption keys available to all said web site pages upon loading (Column 2 lines 30 – 55),

whereby said operator is afforded the convenience of entering said plurality of decryption keys in a single declaration (Column 2 lines 30 – 55).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 6. Furthermore, Chang teaches and describes a method for automatically producing a decrypted display of a cryptogram within a web site page, wherein said key-handling function operates only on the first instance of said cryptogram being loaded into said browser,

whereby said operator is requested to enter said plurality of decryption keys only if an instance of said web site page is encountered while said operator is browsing said web site (Column 2 lines 56 – 66 and Column 8 lines 60 – Column 9 lines 3).

Conclusion

6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 **or**
faxed to: (703) 872-9306 for all formal communications.


Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 703-305-8912. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Pramila Parthasarathy
April 06, 2004


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100